

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: December 21, 2005
Reply to Office action dated: September 22, 2005

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7, 9-12 and 20-29 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1-5, 11 and 20 have been amended and Claim 10 has been cancelled, leaving Claims 1-7, 9, 11, 12 and 20-29 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendment to Claims 1 and 20 are at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended Claim 1 is at least found in cancelled Claim 10, Figure 2 and at Page 11, lines 25-30 and Page 12, line 28 to Page 13, line 8 of the originally filed specification. Support for amended Claim 20 is at least found at Page 16, lines 10-12 of the originally filed specification. Claims 2-5 are amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Claim 11 is amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Regarding Claims 1-7 and 9-12

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 20-22, 26 and 29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tagusa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,986,738 (hereinafter "Tagusa"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claim 10 has been hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and the rejection has been rendered moot for this claim.

Appl. No. 10/619,668

Response dated: December 21, 2005

Reply to Office action dated: September 22, 2005

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*,

"a second conductive layer formed at least in part on the semiconductor layer and including a data line, a drain electrode and a data pad located at an end of the data line, and a third conductive layer formed on the passivation layer and contacting the second conductive layer, the third conductive layer including a pixel electrode and a pad electrode, wherein at least an edge of the upper film lies on the lower film such that the lower film includes a first portion and a second portion exposed out of the upper film of the drain electrode and the data pad respectively, and the pixel electrode and the pad electrode, respectively, contact the first portion and the second portion of the lower film."

Tagusa does not disclose (1) a second conductive layer formed at least in part on the semiconductor layer and including a data line, a drain electrode and a data pad located at an end of the data line, (2) a third conductive layer formed on the passivation layer and contacting the second conductive layer, the third conductive layer including a pixel electrode and a pad electrode and (3) the lower film includes a first portion and a second portion exposed out of the upper film of the drain electrode and the data pad respectively, and the pixel electrode and the pad electrode, respectively, contact the first portion and the second portion of the lower film as claimed. Thus, Tagusa fails to at least teach all of the limitations of at least amended Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct in view of Tagusa. Claims 2-6, 9 and 12 variously depending from Claim 1, thus include all the limitations of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2-6, 9 and 12 are also believed to be patentably distinct in view of Tagusa for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,087,678 (hereinafter "Kim"). Claim 10 has been hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and the rejection has been rendered moot for this claim.

Kim does not disclose that (1) a second conductive layer formed at least in part on the semiconductor layer and including a data line, a drain electrode and a data pad located at an end of the data line, (2) a third conductive layer formed on the passivation layer and contacting the second conductive layer, the third conductive layer including a pixel electrode and a pad electrode, (3) the lower film includes a first portion and a second portion exposed out of the upper film of the drain electrode and the data pad respectively, and the pixel electrode and the

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: December 21, 2005
Reply to Office action dated: September 22, 2005

pad electrode, respectively, contact the first portion and the second portion of the lower film.

Thus, Kim fails to at least teach all of the limitations of amended Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct in view of Kim. Claim 1 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Claims 2, 5-7, 9 and 11 variously depending from Claim 1, thus include all the limitations of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2, 5-7, 9 and 11 are also believed to be patentably distinct in view of Kim for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Claims 2-7, 9, 11 and 12 are not further rejected or objected and are correspondingly allowable as depending from Claim 1. Reconsideration, entry of the amendments and allowance of Claims 1-7, 9, 11 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claims 20-29

Claims 20-22, 26 and 29, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tagusa.

Applicants have amended Claim 20 to recite, *inter alia*, at least one portion of the semiconductor layer is formed along with the data line.

Tagusa does not disclose that a portion of the semiconductor layer is formed along with the data line as claimed. Thus, Tagusa fails to at least teach all of the limitations of at least amended Claim 20.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 20 is patentably distinct in view of Tagusa. Claims 21, 22, 26 and 29 variously depending from Claim 20, thus include all the limitations of amended Claim 20. Therefore, Claims 21, 22, 26 and 29 are also believed to be patentably distinct in view of Tagusa for at least the reasons given for Claim 20.

Claims 20-25, 27 and 28 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kim.

Kim does not does not disclose that a portion of the semiconductor layer is formed along with the data line as claimed. Thus, Kim fails to at least teach all of the limitations of at least amended Claim 20.

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: December 21, 2005
Reply to Office action dated: September 22, 2005

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 20 is patentably distinct in view of Kim. Claim 20 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Claims 21-25, 27 and 28 variously depending from Claim 20, thus include all the limitations of amended Claim 20. Therefore, Claims 21-25, 27 and 28 are also believed to be patentably distinct in view of Kim for at least the reasons given for Claim 20.

Claims 21-29 are not further rejected or objected and are correspondingly allowable as depending from Claim 20. Reconsideration, entry of the amendment and allowance of Claims 20-29 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon Copp
Amy Bizon Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: December 21, 2005